



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/604,315

07/10/2003

Edward E. Kelley

fis920030053

1314

29505 7590 12/29/2006
DELIO & PETERSON, LLC
121 WHITNEY AVENUE
NEW HAVEN, CT 06510

EXAMINER

SMITHERS, MATTHEW

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2137

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
----------------------------------------	-----------	---------------

3 MONTHS

12/29/2006

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/604,315

Applicant(s)

KELLEY ET AL.

Examiner

Matthew B. Smithers

Art Unit

2137

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 July 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-29 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3,8-11 and 14 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 4-7,12,13 and 15-29 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 10 July 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 7/10/03.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Information Disclosure Statement

The information disclosure statement filed July 10, 2003 has been placed in the application file and the information referred to therein has been considered as to the merits.

Claim Objections

Claims 1-29 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(f). Where an application has several claims, the claims shall be numbered consecutively in Arabic numerals. In the instant application, the claims are not numbered as Arabic numerals. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-3, 8-11 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. patent application 20020124053 granted to Adams et al.

Regarding claim 1, Adams meets the claim limitations as follows:

“A method of analyzing conversational patterns to position information sources and autonomic access control list management comprising:

calculating said conversational frequency patterns for a selected user from data stored in a first database;

calculating access of systems, applications, or documents by said selected user; finding other users from a second database;

obtaining a list of systems, applications, or documents utilized by said other users but not by said selected user;

and granting or withdrawing access to said selected user.” see Abstract; paragraphs [0011]; [0012] (. . . For example, the social network monitor . . . monitors all e-mail traffic entering and leaving the computer system of the user . . .); [0013] to [0026]; and Figures 1, 2, and 3B.

Regarding claim 2, Adams meets the claim limitations as follows:

“The method of claim 1 wherein said conversational patterns include at least one record of contact between said selected user and at least one other person.” see Abstract; paragraphs [0012] (. . . For example, the social network monitor . . . monitors all e-mail traffic entering and leaving the computer system of the user . . .); [0013]; [0017]; [0024] to [0025]; and Figures 1, 2, and 3A.

Regarding claim 3, Adams meets the claim limitations as follows:

“The method of claim 1 wherein said step of calculating conversational frequency patterns comprises: obtaining a list of sources from said first database; identifying

individuals for analysis from sources found in said first database; finding existing links among said identified individuals; calculating frequency of contacts; and storing said frequency of contacts in a second database.” see Abstract; paragraphs [0011]; [0012] (. . . For example, the social network monitor . . . monitors all e-mail traffic entering and leaving the computer system of the user . . .); [0013] to [0026]; and Figures 1, 2, and 3B.

Regarding claim 8, Adams meets the claim limitations as follows:

“The method of claim 1 further comprising: building a list of systems, applications, or documents regularly accessed by conversational partners of persons who received a file or document located on one of said systems; and searching said system indices for said file or document in repositories.” see Abstract; paragraphs [0011]; [0012] (. . . For example, the social network monitor . . . monitors all e-mail traffic entering and leaving the computer system of the user . . .); [0013] to [0026]; and Figures 1, 2, and 3B.

Regarding claim 9, Adams meets the claim limitations as follows:

“The method of claim 1 further comprising tracking said conversational patterns through instant-messaging, emails, or telephonic communications and searching said patterns by keywords.” see Abstract; paragraphs [0012] (. . . For example, the social network monitor . . . monitors all e-mail traffic entering and leaving the computer system of the user . . .); [0013]; [0017]; [0024] to [0025]; and Figures 1, 2, and 3A.

Regarding claim 10, Adams meets the claim limitations as follows:

“The method of claim 1 further comprising prompting said other users if said selected user gains access to said systems, applications, or documents, and inquiring of said

selected user if said access is desired, or granting access to said selected user and opening said system, application, or document.” see Abstract; paragraphs [0011]; [0012]; [0015] and Figures 1, 2, and 3B.

Regarding claim 11, Adams meets the claim limitations as follows:

“A method of analyzing conversational patterns to position information sources and autonomic access control list management comprising: obtaining a list of sources from a first database; identifying individuals for analysis from said sources found in said first database; finding existing links among said identified individuals; calculating frequency of contacts among said identified individuals; storing said frequency of contacts in a second database; obtaining a list of systems, applications, or documents from a third database; obtaining access control lists from said list of systems, applications, or documents; calculating frequency of access to said systems, applications, or documents; storing said frequency of access in a fourth database; obtaining a list of systems, applications, or documents utilized by other users but not by said identified individuals; and granting or withdrawing access to said identified individuals.” see Abstract; paragraphs [0011]; [0012] (. . . For example, the social network monitor . . . monitors all e-mail traffic entering and leaving the computer system of the user . . .); [0013] to [0026]; and Figures 1, 2, and 3B.

Regarding claim 14, Adams meets the claim limitations as follows:

“The method of claim 11 further comprising prompting said other users if said identified individuals gain access to said systems, applications, or documents, and inquiring of said identified individuals if said access is desired, or granting access to said identified

individuals and opening said system, application, or document.” see Abstract; paragraphs [0011]; [0012]; [0015] and Figures 1, 2, and 3B.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 4-7, 12-13, and 15-29 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter:

With respect to claims 4-6, the cited prior art fails to specifically teach the step of calculating system, application, or document access comprises: obtaining a list of systems, applications, or documents from a third database; obtaining access control lists from said list of systems, applications, or documents; calculating frequency of access to said systems, applications, or documents; and storing said frequency of access in a fourth database.

With respect to claim 7, the cited prior art fails to specifically teach the method of claim 1 further comprising: matching conversational partners with system users; building a first structure identifying people with whom said selected user has documented conversations; building a second structure identifying people within said selected user's group of said conversational partners who regularly access said systems, applications, or documents; identifying similarities between said first and second structures; identifying subsets not employed by said selected user, but matching frequently used

systems, applications, or documents of said selected user's conversational partners; and prioritizing said subsets and presenting said subsets to said selected user.

With respect to claims 12 and 13, the cited prior art fails to specifically teach the method of claim 11 further comprising: matching conversational partners with said identified individuals; building a first structure identifying people with whom said identified individuals have documented conversations; building a second structure identifying people within said identified individuals' groups of said conversational partners who regularly access said systems, applications, or documents; identifying similarities between said first and second structures; identifying subsets not employed by said identified individuals, but matching frequently used systems, applications, or documents of said identified individuals' conversational partners; and prioritizing said subsets and presenting said subsets to said user.

With respect to claims 15-20, the cited prior art fails to specifically teach the method of claim 1 including deploying process software for analysis of conversational patterns to position information and autonomic access control list management, said deployment comprising: installing said process software on at least one server; identifying server addresses for users accessing said process software on said at least one server; installing a proxy server if needed; sending said process software to said at least one server via a file transfer protocol, or sending a transaction to said at least one server containing said process software and receiving and copying said process software to said at least one server's file system; accessing said process software on a user's client computer file system; and executing said process software by said users.

With respect to claim 21, the cited prior art fails to specifically teach the method of claim 1 including integrating process software for analysis of conversational patterns to position information and autonomic access control list management, said integration comprising: determining if said process software will execute on at least one server; identifying said at least one server address, including checking said at least one server for operating systems, applications, network operating systems, or version numbers for validation with said process software, and identifying any missing software applications that are required for integration; updating said operating systems, said applications, or said network operating systems that are not validated for said process software, and providing any of said missing software applications required for said integration; identifying client addresses and checking said client's computers for operating systems, applications, network operating systems, or version numbers for validation with said process software, and identifying any missing software applications that are required for integration; updating said client's computers with said operating systems, said applications, or said network operating systems that are not validated for said process software, and providing any of said missing software applications required for said integration; and installing said process software on said client's computers and said at least one server.

With respect to claims 22-26, the cited prior art fails to specifically teach the method of claim 1 including on demand sharing of process software for analysis of conversational patterns to position information and autonomic access control list management, said on demand sharing comprising: creating a transaction containing

unique customer identification, requested service type, and service parameters; sending said transaction to at least one main server; querying said server's central processing unit capacity for adequate processing of said transaction; and allocating additional central processing unit capacity when additional capacity is needed to process said transaction, and adding said additional central processing unit capacity to said server, or checking environmental capacity for processing said transaction, including network bandwidth, processor memory, or storage, and allocating said environmental capacity as required.

With respect to claims 27-29, the cited prior art fails to specifically teach the method of claim 1 including deploying, accessing, and executing process software for analysis of conversational patterns to position information and autonomic access control list management through a virtual private network, said method further comprising: determining if said virtual private network is required; checking for remote access of said virtual private network; if said remote access does not exist, identifying a third party provider to provide secure, encrypted connections between a private network and remote users, identifying said remote users, and setting up a network access server for downloading and installing desktop client software for remotely accessing said virtual private network; accessing said process software; transporting said process software to said remote user's desktop; and executing said process software on said remote user's desktop.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

A. McKeeth (US 20050022005) discloses a system for controlling user access to an electronic device.

B. Ho et al (US 20040254934) discloses a system for setting an access control list rule for content management.

C. Elder et al (US 20040088325) discloses a system for building social networks based on activity around shared objects.

D. Goodwin et al (US 20030135818) discloses a system for calculating a user's affinity score based on actions performed on a document by a user.

E. Houston et al (US 7,058,630) discloses a system for controlling access to a database.

F. French et al (US 7,047,234) discloses a system for managing database access.

G. Kraenzel (US 6,513,039) discloses a method for profile inferencing through automated access control list analysis.


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Matthew B. Smithers whose telephone number is (571) 272-3876. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday (8:00-4:30) EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Emmanuel L. Moise can be reached on (571) 272-3865. The fax phone

Art Unit: 2137

number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.


Matthew B Smithers
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2137